UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,453	03/31/2004	Ricardo E. Gonzalez	PA2718US	7783
22830 CARR & FERR	7590 05/24/201 RELL LLP	EXAMINER		
2200 GENG RO	OAD	MCLEOD, MARSHALL M		
PALO ALTO, CA 94303			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2457	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/24/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/815,453	GONZALEZ ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	WINTER MOLEGE	2401
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>26 April 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APF	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LLOWANCE.
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Application (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or the statutory period for reply expire I	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07( Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropriate extension fee nally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	pliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be t	filed within two months of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,</li> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further co</li> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)</li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NOT	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially rec	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
<ul><li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li><li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al</li></ul>		timely filed amendment canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	·	•
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <a href="mailto:1-26 and 81-89">1-26 and 81-89</a> .		l be entered and an explanation of
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>		
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea y and was not earlier presented.  Se	al and/or appellant fails to provide a see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attached.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowance because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s).</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	
	/Ramy M Osman/	
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2457

## **Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)**

Application No.

With respect to applicant's arguments on page 17 of applicant's remarks applicant's contend that "A transceiver provides the functionality of both a transmitter and a receiver by definition. By providing both transmitter functions and receiver functions, a transceiver is necessarily, and quintessentially, an element for bi- directional communication". The examiner respectfully disagrees and states to applicant's that, it is well known in the art that when given its broadest reasonable interpretation a trasceiver does not have to utilize both its function for transmission and reception. A transceiver can work soley in a transmit or receive mode. Applicants use of "unidirectional" is broad. Applicant's next contend on page 17 that "array" in the body of claim 1 has patentable weight, and that an array inherently implies order. Hence, a collection of nodes is not the same as an array of nodes. The examiner respectfully disagrees and states to applicant's that Chupron (Column 6, lines 13-21) discloses selecting a specific path within the array to communicate, i.e. utilizing the nodes in a specific order. Furthermore the examiner respectfully states to applicant's that applicant's lack of specificity with the use of the term array allows for a broad interpretation of the term and as such a person skilled in the art can interpret any network of nodes in a region as being in some kind of order.